

REMARKS

Claims 2-4, 6-8, 11-20, 27-29 and 34-40 are pending herein.

I. The allowed claims.

Applicants respectfully thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 2-4, 6-8, 11-20, 34-37, and 40 are allowed.

II. The rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

The USPTO respectfully rejects claims 27-29 and 38-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicants regard as their invention. Claims 38 and 39 are independent claims, and claims 27-29 depend from claim 39.

Applicants respectfully note that claims 38 and 39 have been amended for § 112 purposes. Specifically, applicants respectfully note that the preamble of claim 38 is amended to more clearly state that the claim is directed to a printer client apparatus. Additionally, the preamble of claim 39 has been amended to more clearly state that the claim is directed to a server apparatus. Thus, it is respectfully asserted that the § 112 rejections of claims 38-39 have been overcome.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully note that the preambles of dependent claims 27-29 have been amended to match the preamble of independent claim 39. Therefore, it is respectfully asserted that the § 112 rejection of claims 27-29 has been overcome.

III. The rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

The USPTO respectfully rejects claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the USPTO respectfully alleges that claim 38 is directed to software with no structural element.

Applicants respectfully note that claim 38 has been amended so that claim 38 is more clearly directed to a printer client apparatus, and not printer client software as respectfully alleged by the USPTO. No new matter is introduced by these amendments. Support for the amendments can be found on pages 9-10 of the present specification.

Specifically, page 10 of the present specification indicates that printer client 200 is capable of printing and displaying. Additionally, pages 9-10 of the present specification describes the printer client as capable of being “installed” in a convenience store, place of business, or library. Thus, the printer client is an apparatus capable of printing data, and therefore claim 38 is respectfully directed to an apparatus, and not software.

Thus, it is respectfully asserted that the § 101 rejection to claim 38 has been overcome.

IV. Conclusion.


Reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims is respectfully requested.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Please contact the undersigned for any reason. Applicants seek to cooperate with the Examiner including via telephone if convenient for the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By 
Daniel P. Lent
Registration No. 44,867

Date: June 22, 2007
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No.: 23413